

REMARKS

Claims 21-37 are now in this application.

Claims 21 and 27 have been amended to add clarity.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 21-37 is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Claims 21, 24, 26-28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Vantalon, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,216,358 B1 (hereinafter “Vantalon”).

Applicant's claims are directed to a unitary, integrated, television set (a TV) that includes a PCMCIA slot for a PCMCIA card. A PCMCIA card can include memory thereon for storing television signals. The claimed TV does not include a built in recording unit. Since there is no built in recording unit, the claimed TV receiver can be relatively inexpensive and because it has a PCMCIA slot, with the addition of an appropriate PCMCIA card, it still has the capability of recording televisions programs. Claims 21 and 27 have been amended to make explicitly clear the claimed TV receiver is a stand alone complete TV receiver that includes a display

The Vantalon reference describes a “digital broadband receiving unit” that is adapted for connection to one or more display units and one or more recording units. An overall diagram of Vantalon’s system is shown in Vantalon’s Figure 1. The receiver units are designated 10, the display units are designated 13 and the recording units are designated 14.

The displays and receivers shown in Vantalon are discussed at the bottom of column 3 of the Vantalon reference which states:

"Typical display units include television sets and television and computer monitors. Typical recording units include VCR-type video recorders and various types of computer memory units."

Figure 4 of Vantalon shows the host 16 connected to a conditional access module 17 which is in turn connected to the smart card unit 28. The host is also connected to the TV display unit 13.

It is important to note that the smart card unit 28 is not part of the TV display unit 13 and it is only connected to the TV display unit through the conditional access module 17 and the host 16. Figure 5 of Vantalon shows PCMCIA interface 70 supplies signals to the smart card interface 72.

The above arrangement is significantly different from the combination claimed by the applicant. In the claimed combination, the PCMCIA interface is an integral part of the claimed TV. Thus the applicant is claiming a TV which includes as a part thereof a PCMCIA interface; whereas the reference shows a system which includes a TV receiver and where another unit in the system has a PCMCIA interface.

In particular applicant's claim 21 calls for:

"A standalone television receiver (TV) that does not include a built in TV program recording device, said TV including:

a display device for displaying received images,

a PCMCIA card (Personal Computer Memory Card International Association card) interface slot in said TV, said PCMCIA card interface slot adapted to receive a removable PCMCIA card which includes electronic circuitry,

.....
interface circuitry adapted to connect circuitry on said PCMCIA card to said buffer whereby encoded TV signals can be transferred to said electronic circuitry on said PCMCIA card".

Independent claim 27 includes similar language to that quoted above from claims 21.

In summary, claims 21 and 27 specify that the PCMCIA slot is an integral part of the TV set. The Vantalon reference shows a system that includes a number of units, one of which is a TV set. The system shown in Vantalon includes a PCMCIA slot in a different unit in the system. The PCMCIA slot is not in the TV set as it is in the combination claimed by the applicant.

For the above reasons reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 21 and 27 is respectfully requested.

With respect to dependent claims 24, 26, 27, 28 and 30, applicant submits that these claims are patentable for the same reasons as explained above relative to their parent claims. Reconsideration of dependent claims 24, 26, 27, 28 and 30 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 25 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Hong, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0039245 A1 (hereinafter “Hong”) and **claims 22, 23 and 29** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Ross, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,859,628 (hereinafter “Ross”).

Claims 22, 23, 25, 29 and 31 are dependent claims. Applicant submits that these claims are patentable for the same reasons as explained above relative to their parent claims. The additionally cited Hong and Ross do not address the deficiencies discussed above relative to the parent claims. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 22, 23, 25, 29 and 31 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 32, 33 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Speasi, et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0129385 A1 (hereinafter “Speasi”).

Applicant submits that these claims are patentable for the same reasons as explained above relative to claims 21 and 27. In particular independent claim 32 specifies:

“A television set (TV) including a PCMCIA card interface slot
in said TV” (emphasis added).

As explained above, the Vantalon reference shows a system that includes several units, one of which is a TV set and one of which is connected to a PCMCIA slot. However, in the system shown in Vantalon, the PCMCIA slot is located in the conditional access module; it is not located in the TV set as claimed by the applicant.

For the above reasons, reconsideration and allowance of claims 32, 33 and 36 is respectfully requested.

Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Speasi as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Hong and Claims 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vantalon in view of Speasi and further in view of Ross.

Claims 34, 35 and 37 are dependent upon claim 32. The Speasi and Hong references do not overcome the deficiencies discussed above relative to the Vantalon reference. Thus applicant submits that these claims are patentable for the same reasons as discussed above relative to claim 32, and thus, reconsideration and allowance of claims 34, 35 and 37 is respectfully requested.

In summary, reconsideration and allowance of claims 21 to 37 is respectfully requested for the reasons explained above.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Elmer W. Galbi
Reg. No. 19,761

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
503-222-3613
E-mail: elmer@techlaw.com